

segment bordered caudally with fuscous, and base of anal pro-legs coloured the same. Venter marked along the middle with a stripe like those on dorsum and sides, which are about equidistant from each other and of about the same width as the spaces between them, colour reddish-brown. Some of the spaces (yellowish-white) have dark points in them. Head and thoracic shield yellowish-brown. Feet fuscous and dirty yellow. Four pairs of pro-legs besides anal pair, which are of the same colour as the ground colour of the body. Base of anal pair black.

"A number of these worms working in peach leaves were received from Mr. T. D. Atkinson, of Holland, Michigan, in September, 1898, and were said to be very troublesome. The same species was received on July 3rd, 1899, from Monroe, Michigan. One or two complaints were made from other places, though no specimens were sent.

"The larvæ are very restive, wriggling violently when disturbed. They bind together the leaves of the peach with fine white silk, forming nests of loosely-bound leaves, in which they live and where they change to pupæ. The finding of the larvæ on July 3rd, and also on September 17th, would seem a good indication that the insect is two-brooded. Specimens of the larvæ from Holland were placed in suitable cages, and the moth, a nearly black insect, spreading about five-eighths of an inch, was obtained the following spring. The adults commenced to appear about April 14th and continued to emerge till the middle of May. Of course this is much earlier than would happen if the insects were out of doors."

Prof. Pettit's article was accompanied by excellent enlarged illustrations of the larva and pupa.

#### CONDEMNABLE PRACTICES IN GENERIC REVISIONS.

SIR,—Permit me to call the attention of your readers to a faulty method of citing species names, which is, unfortunately, extremely common in America. I refer to the omission of the genus name or its reduction to a mere initial. In many cases this is, of course, a proceeding that is attended with no serious evil effects. A working zoologist may be expected to know what *P. machaon* stands for, bibliographers would know that a paper on Abnormal Antennæ of *Ajax* had nothing to do with the Bird genus, *Ajax*, LESS., but referred to *Papilio ajax*. In many cases, however, authors seem to endeavor to render their work inaccessible to all save specialists working on their particular group. To make this clear

it is necessary to cite an example, and I take the first one at hand, remarking at the same time that these cases are very numerous, and that it is unjust to single out a particular person for condemnation.

In a paper published in Vol. 30 of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, some 33 new genera of Phytophaga are proposed in consequence of the rearrangement of this group. In all cases, save one, the author is careful to state the species that served as types for the new genera, but in every case the old genus is represented by its initial merely, so that neither the direct statements of the author nor the context give the slightest clue to the name. Let us take a specific illustration. On pp. 286-287 is given a table of the genera of Hemichroinæ, of which three are recognized: "*Hemichroa*, CURTIS; *Opisthoneura*, ASHM., n. g. (type *O. crevecœuri*, ASHM.); *Marlattia*, ASHM., n. g. (type *H. laricis*, MARL.)." What, pray, is *O. crevecœuri*? It can not be *Opisthoneura*, for that is a new genus, and the species *crevecœuri* is not new. What does *H. laricis* mean? It is true that in this case the bibliographer can, by comparing species by species with DALLE TORRE'S catalogue, ascertain with great probability what these initials mean; but this involves many hours of study, and the Hymenoptera form the only group for which this would be at all practicable. Indeed, the recorder of the Zoological Record did not take such pains, so that in his report the initials have been allowed to stand quite out of connection with the original grouping, so that the confusion is still further increased.

But why should a scientific writer impose such burdens upon his readers? I refuse to believe that motives of economy force editors to print H. for *Hemichroa*, or that a man of science begrudges the few extra strokes of the pen necessary to make his published work intelligible. No, it is a mere matter of thoughtless habit, which needs only to be pointed out to be corrected.

HERBERT HAVILAND FIELD.

Zurich, Switzerland.

#### A NEW GENUS OF APHELININÆ FROM CHILE.

BY L. O. HOWARD, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Since the publication of the writer's "Revision of the Aphelininæ of North America" (Bulletin 1, Technical Series, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, 1895), the discovery of new forms,